AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q106240

Application No.: 10/733,417

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Speckhart et al. (US 5,687,850)

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, a mobile device comprising:

means for moving along a runway in a predetermined path;

a receiving means for receiving and supporting the collected articles while moving along the runway in the predetermined path.

a radio-frequency (RF) interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles collected by the device.

In the rejection, the Examiner alleges loader 12 corresponds to the recited "mobile device" and conveyor 11 corresponds to the recited "predetermined path."

As an initial matter, the loader 12, which allegedly anticipates the mobile device of the invention is discussed in column 4 lines 7 to 15. In this portion of the disclosure, Speckhart cross references US application N°08/504,359, which has issued at U.S. Patent 5,660,261 to Speckhart (Speckhart erroneously identifies this as U.S. App. No. 08/504,269). However, U.S. Patent 5,660,261 discloses the loader is a ramp device, *i.e.*, a fixed device, positioned at the entry of the conveyor. Furthermore, Speckhart discloses that the each garment is identified as it is loaded at one of the loaders 12. *See* 6:9-15. However, while Speckhart discloses an RF reader may be used for this identification, it discloses that the RF reader is disposed at a fixed position

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q106240

Application No.: 10/733,417

along this loader 12, i.e., ramp, for the identification of an article before it is loaded onto the conveyor. Consequently, Speckhart fails to disclose an RF reader on a mobile device. Rather, only a stationary RF reader is contemplated. Thus, Speckhart fails to disclose a mobile device having a radio-frequency (RF) interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles collected by the device.

Therefore, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable because Speckhart fails to disclose all the features recited in the claim. Further, claims 2-11 are submitted to be allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

New Claims

New claims 12-20 are added by this Amendment. These claims correspond to claims 1-9 but do not recite "means" language. These claims are allowable for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

8

Attorney Docket No.: Q106240

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 10/733,417

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 15, 2009

David P. Emery

Registration No. 55,154